



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

758 ἦδοι' ἄν, οἶμαι, τήνδ' ἰδοῦσα συμφοράν, *i. e.* εἰ ἴδοις κτλ.
 Δ 539 ἔνθα κεν οὐκέτι ἔργον ἀνὴρ ὀνόσαιο μετελθών.

It is often impossible to pronounce dogmatically as to the form of the finite verb which the participle represents, but in general its correspondence to some finite form of the same tense is unquestioned.

It has been shown that of the attributive, the supplementary, and the circumstantial participles, a large majority correspond to the aorist indicative and refer distinctly to past time. From this great preponderance of the participles which refer to past time, it is easy to see that there would be an increasing tendency to use the aorist participle as if by natural right it referred to an act which preceded that of the principal verb, whether the finite verb which the participle represented would have been in the aorist, imperfect, or pluperfect indicative. In general, however, this participle either retained its original achronic force or represents the aorist indicative.

VI. — *On the Verbal Abstract Nouns in -σις in Thucydides.*

By E. G. SIHLER, PH.D.,

NEW YORK CITY.

ONE of the most striking features of the style of Thucydides is his tendency towards condensation; and this is particularly observable in his use of verbal nouns in *-σις*. Such nouns occur, roughly speaking, 400 times. A few of them had obtained general currency before the time of this historian, — for example, *ὄψις*, *τάξις*, sundry compounds of *-βασις*, *πρόφασις*, etc. The great majority of them, however, are distinctly Thucydidean. Stahl's edition contains 471 pages. Using this as a basis of calculation, these verbals occur, on the average, once in $1\frac{1}{6}$ pages of text. The average amount of text in which one occurrence is found, is, for the several books, as follows: for book i., $1\frac{2}{5}$ pages; ii., $1\frac{1}{4}$; iii., $\frac{5}{6}$; iv., $1\frac{1}{4}$; v., $1\frac{1}{3}$; vi., $1\frac{3}{8}$; vii., $\frac{5}{6}$; viii., 2. Comparing these with

the general average, $1\frac{1}{6}$, the diversities are, on the whole, too small to warrant any inferences as to the stylistic development of Thucydides, although the last book may possibly have been less thoroughly worked over into the characteristic diction of the author.

In respect of function and usage these nouns show differences sufficient to be made the basis of their classification. They are found :

1. As substantives, pure and simple ; as subject, or object, or predicate-noun ; and in prepositional phrases.
2. With a genitive objective attached. Here their verbal force is well maintained.
3. Introducing constructions such as would properly follow a verb.
4. In dependence upon a genitive subjective or possessive.
5. In periphrases with *ποιεῖσθαι*, *γίγνεσθαι*, *ἔχειν*, *παρέχειν*, *εἶναι*.

1. The purely substantive nouns in *-σις*. Of these many are employed by Thucydides in a purely concrete sense ; *e. g.* *οἰκησις*, ii. 17, 1, *ὀλίγοις μὲν τισιν ὑπῆρχον οἰκήσεις* ; *ἐνθύμησις*, i. 132, 5, *κατὰ ἐνθύμησίν τινα* ; *ἀναχώρησις*, 'place of refuge,' i. 90, 2, *τὴν Πελοπόννησον ἱκανὴν εἶναι ἀναχώρησιν καὶ ἀφορμὴν ἐπὶ κλησις* occurs as a synonym of *ὄνομα* i. 3, 2 ; *καὶ πάνν οὐδὲ εἶναι ἢ ἐπὶ κλησις αὕτη*. This employment of the nouns in *-σις* in a concrete sense is particularly manifest where these nouns are coupled with concrete substantives proper, as the correlatives or equivalents of the latter ; *e. g.* vi. 48, *καὶ λιμένα καὶ ἐφόρμησιν τῇ στρατιᾷ ἔσεσθαι* ; iv. 126, 1, *βραχεὶ ὑπομνήματι καὶ παραινέσει* ; viii. 1, 2, *περιεστῆκει φόβος καὶ κατάπληξις*.

Double compound verbs are changed into verbal nouns as well as simple compounds, and illustrate very strikingly the energy of condensation attained by the writer, however harsh the effect may be. Thus *ἀντεξόρμησις*, ii. 91, 4, *ἀξύμορον δρῶντες πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ὀλίγου ἀντεξόρμησιν* ; *προεκφόβησις*, v. 11, 2, *ἀπὸ τοιαύτης ξυντυχίας καὶ προεκφοβήσεως*.

Plurals occur rarely, mostly in a distributive sense ; *e. g.* i.

2, 1, φαίνεται μεταναστάσεις οὔσαι ; iii. 97, 3, καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ πολλὴ τοιαύτη ἡ μάχη, διώξεις τε καὶ ὑπαγωγαί ; v. 66, 4, καὶ αἱ παραγγέλσεις, ἦν τι βούλονται, κατὰ τὰ χωροῦσι κτλ. ; vi. 46, 3, καὶ ἰδίᾳ ξενίσεις ποιούμενοι . . . ἐσέφερον ἐς τὰς ἐστιάσεις ; vii. 12, 5, αἱ ἐπιχειρήσεις ἐπ' ἐκείνοις (ἐισί). In one case the articular infinitive is combined with the plural of the abstract noun, vii. 70, 4, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τὰς ἀνακρούσεις. The practical use of these nouns for the purpose of brachylogy is very well illustrated in the combination with a complex attributive modifier ; thus ii. 18, 4, μάλιστα δὲ ἡ ἐν Οἰνῇ ἐπίσχεσις (διέβαλεν αὐτόν) ; ii. 91, 4, ἀξύμφορον δρῶντες πρὸς τὴν ἐξ ὀλίγου ἀντεξόρμησιν ; iii. 102, 3, διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς Λευκάδος ἀναχώρησιν ; cf. iv. 76, 1 ; vii. 31, 1, μετὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς Λακωνικῆς τείχισιν ; cf. vii. 44, 8 ; vii. 86, 5, διὰ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν.

In a small number of cases nouns in -σις occur as object, and present the full equivalent of what in more common construction would be a complete sub-clause. Thus after verbs of fearing, iii. 33, 1, δεδιὼς τὴν δίωξιν ; iii. 78, 1, οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι φοβούμενοι τὴν περικύκλωσιν ; or after verbs looking toward the future, as σπένδεσθαι, iii. 24, 3, ἐσπένδοντο ἀναίρεσιν τοῖς νεκροῖς ; or ψηφίζεσθαι, vii. 48, 1, ψηφιζομένους τὴν ἀναχώρησιν.

2. The second prominent construction in which these nouns are found is that with a genitive objective attached. As to the proportion of occurrence, this is by far the most frequent employment, comprising some 125 out of a total of 400, or some 31 per cent of the whole. This class best exhibits the general function of the formation, retaining on the one hand almost all the active functions of the verb, and lending itself on the other to all the modifiers which nouns may take. Thus there may be expressed with greater precision the logical relation to the leading clause or governing word, be that relation temporal, causal, or purely one of manner, or final, or the equivalent of an indirect statement.

Thus we have the equivalent of *temporal clauses*, especially through the vinculum of *μετά* ; as in i. 12, 3, μετὰ Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ; i. 18, 1, μετὰ τὴν τῶν τυράννων κατάλυσιν ἐκ τῆς

Ἑλλάδος ; vi. 4, 3, μετὰ Συρακουσῶν οἰκισιν ; vi. 5, 3, μετὰ Συρακουσῶν κτίσιν. Instrumental relation is almost always expressed by the dative, and not by means of διὰ with the genitive ; thus, i. 6, 3, χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐνέρσει ; ii. 37, 3, τῶν τε αἰὲν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει καὶ τῶν νόμων ; ii. 94, 4, λιμένων τε κλήσει καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἐπιμελείᾳ ; iii. 82, 1, τῇ τῶν ἐναντίων κακώσει καὶ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ προσποιήσει ; iii. 82, 3, ἐπιπύσσει τῶν προγεγενημένων ; *ibidem*, τῶν ἐπιχειρήσεων περιτεχνήσει ; iii. 82, 8, ἀριστοκρατίας σῶφρονος προτιμήσει ; vii. 48, 3, οὐκ ἄλλων ἐπιτιμήσει ; viii. 57, 1-2 ; μὴ τῆς τροφῆς ζητήσει πορθήσῃσι τὴν γῆν.

Purpose and final relation are generally expressed by the vinculum of ἐπὶ with the dative ; iii. 10, 3, ξύμμαχοι μέντοι ἐγενόμεθα οὐκ ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει τῶν Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηναίοις, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἐλευθερώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ Μήδου τοῖς Ἕλλησι ; similarly in v. 27, 2, ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει τῆς Πελοποννήσου ; vi. 82, 1, ἐπὶ τῆς πρότερον οὔσης ξυμμαχίας ἀνανεώσει ; vii. 66, 2, ἐπὶ τῆς Σικελίας καταδουλώσει. εἰς (ἐς) and πρὸς are used to designate result and specification.

Here, too, harshness and obscurity result from excessive accumulation ; thus several of these nouns are construed together, composite attributives are inserted, a few double compounds are met with, and in a few cases several of these features are combined. The difficulty of Thucydides, of which some critics make too much and some too little, may be explained in good part from the employment of such constructions. For instance, in i. 25, 4, we have a double compound in -σις governing a genitive objective, and itself depending upon a genitive subjective, κατὰ τὴν τῶν Φαίακων προενοίκησιν τῆς Κερκύρας ; so i. 137, 4, γράψας τὴν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος προάγγελσιν τῆς ἀναχωρήσεως καὶ τὴν τῶν γεφυρῶν ἦν ψευδῶς προσεποιήσατο τότε δι' αὐτὸν οὐ διάλυσιν. The harshness of Thucydides in such constructions has often been adverted to by critics from Dionysius onward. A similar case of accumulated modifiers is found in v. 35, 2, κατὰ τὴν τῶν χωρίων ἀλλήλοις οὐκ ἀπόδοσιν ; iv. 81, 2, τοῦ πολέμου ἀπὸ τῆς Πελοποννήσου λώφῃσιν ; v. 50, 4, κατὰ τὴν οὐκ ἐξουσίαν τῆς ἀγωνίσεως ; iv. 126, 5, ἥ τε διὰ κενῆς ἐπανάσεισις τῶν ὅπλων ἔχει τινα δῆλωσιν ἀπειλῆς. The

accumulation reaches a climax in v. 65, 2, δηλὼν τῆς ἐξ Ἑργου ἐπαίτιον ἀναχωρήσεως τὴν παρούσαν ἄκαιρον προθυμίαν ἀνάληψιν βουλόμενον εἶναι; and again in v. 105, 1, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕξω τῆς ἀνθρωπείας τῶν μὲν ἐς τὸ θεῖον νομίσεως, τῶν δὲ ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βουλήσεως δικαιοῦμεν ἢ πράσσομεν. In vii. 34, 6 we have a rather harsh combination of genitive subjective and objective, viz., διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνέμου ἄπωσιν αὐτῶν ἐς τὸ πέλαγος. This excessive striving after condensation leads Thucydides to attach a genitive objective directly to a noun in -σις the etymology of which does not really permit such directness, as in the phrase ἐν ἀποβάσει τῆς γῆς, i. 108, 5. Here ἀπόβασις is not, what it often is, a concrete thing, 'landing-place,' but (as the context proves — against Liddell and Scott) the abstract active noun in a modal sense, equivalent to ἀποβαίνοντες ἐς τὴν γῆν.

3. In the third class, a small one, we place those which have other and most specifically verbal construction attached; nouns which in such connection are treated as if they had all the power and functions of verbs proper. Thus an indirect question is attached to δῆλωσις, i. 73, 3, μαρτυρίου καὶ δηλώσεως (ἐνεκα) πρὸς οἷαν πόλιν — ὁ ἀγὼν καταστήσεται. In another place we have a complete object-clause construed with ἐνθύμησις, i. 132, 5, κατὰ ἐνθύμησιν τινα ὅτι οὐδεὶς πω τῶν πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἀγγέλων πάλιν ἐφίκετο. At ii. 41, 3, we have ἀγανάκτησις with the full construction of ἀγανακτεῖν, and κατὰμεμφις with that of καταμέμφεσθαι; μόνη οὔτε τῷ πολέμῳ ἐπελθόντι ἀγανάκτησιν ἔχει ὑφ' οἷων κακοπαθεῖ οὔτε τῷ ὑπηκόῳ κατὰμεμφιν ὡς οὐχ ὑπ' ἀξίων ἄρχεται. The *genitivus privandi* after στερεῖν is maintained after στέρησις, ii. 63, 1, περὶ ἀρχῆς στέρησεως. Twice do we meet the future infinitive after δόκησις, which is thus differentiated from the more concrete δόξα, ii. 84, 1, δόκησιν παρέχοντες αὐτίκα ἐμβαλεῖν; iv. 55, 2, τῆς δοκῆσεώς τι πράξειν. The dative of interest after καταδουλοῦν is made to go with καταδουλώσεως, vi. 76, 3, περὶ . . . σφίσιν ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐκείνῳ καταδουλώσεως. The object-clause after ἀνακαλεῖν is left unchanged after ἀνάκλησις, vii. 71, 3, πρὸς ἀνάκλησιν θεῶν μὴ στερεῖσαι σφᾶς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐτρέποντο.

4. We now reach that construction of nouns in -σις where

the latter are dependent upon a genitive subjective or possessive. The proportion of occurrence of this construction is much smaller than of that with the genitive objective. There are found about 42 cases or 10 per cent of the whole, whereas the cases of construction with the genitive objective constitute some 132 or 33 per cent of all cases. In the construction with the genitive subjective or possessive the noun naturally assumes more of a substantive character and becomes further removed from the signification of its verbal original than in the object-construction. Moreover there was probably some tacit feeling on the part of the writer which led him to avoid confusion with that class. In this employment, too, we may notice the freedom with which Thucydides uses double compounds; thus in ii. 27, 2, *εὐεργέται ἦσαν ὑπὸ . . . τῶν Εἰλώτων τὴν ἐπανάστασιν*; and in iv. 128, 4, *ὀργιζόμενοι τῇ προαναχωρήσει τῶν Μακεδόνων*. In one case, quoted above, we find the harsh combination of genitive subjective and objective, vii. 34, 6, *διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνέμου ἄπωσιν αὐτῶν ἐς τὸ πέλαγος*. A number of nouns in this construction assume decidedly concrete sense: thus, *ἀπόστασις*, 'revolt'; *ποίησις*, 'poetical works'; *μέλλησις*, 'delay'; *ὄπλις*, 'equipment'; *ὑπόσχεσις*, 'promise'; *ἀνάλωσις*, 'expenditure'; *ἐκπληξις*, 'fright'; *ἀνάβασις*, 'approach'; in concrete topographical sense, *διάβασις*, 'ford'; *ἀπόβασις*, 'landing-place.' A few illustrations will suffice; i. 10, 3, *τῇ Ὀμήρου ποιήσει*; vi. 31, 5, *εἰ γάρ τις ἐλογίσατο τὴν — τῆς πόλεως ἀνάλωσιν*; vi. 78, 2, *οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνης δυνάμεως βούλησιν ἐλπίζει*; iv. 39, 3, *καὶ τοῦ Κλέωνος καίπερ μανιώδης οὔσα ἡ ὑπόσχεσις ἀπέβη*; i. 69, 4, *τὴν αὖξῃσιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν καταλύοντες*; iii. 78, 4, *ἐς ἡλίου δύσιν*; vii. 42, 3, *ἀποχρήσασθαι τῇ παρούσῃ τοῦ στρατεύματος ἐκπλήξει* (*ἐκπληξις* occurs 8 times in Thucydides, whereas the average occurrence of all other nouns in *-σις* is twice each); vii. 42, 4, *εἰ κρατήσῃ τις τῶν . . . Ἐπιπολῶν τῆς ἀναβάσεως*; vii. 74, 2, *τῶν ρείθρων καὶ ποταμῶν διαβάσεις ἐφύλασσον*.

5. The last construction to be considered is the periphrastic. Hitherto we have seen that these nouns serve as a means of compact statement, that they are a contrivance for

condensation. Is the same thing to be said of the periphrastic construction? Is it not really an expansion? Could not Thucydides say ἀποβαίνειν or ἀποβήναι instead of ἀπόβασιν ποιεῖσθαι? We must not forget that the striving after logical precision is as strong in Thucydides as that after condensation, and that nouns admit of more concise modification than verbs. The force of habit, also, doubtless told on his phraseology; it became stereotyped in many modes of expression. I have noticed some seventy instances of these periphrastic locutions. Thirty-two are made with ποιεῖσθαι. Once only — where the subject acts merely as the instrument — ποιεῖν is used, iv. 20, 2, τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησιν ἀνάπανσιν κακῶν ποιήσωμεν. In point of frequency ποιεῖσθαι is followed by γίγνεσθαι; with this verb seventeen of these periphrases are made. The other periphrases are with ἔχειν, παρέχειν, εἶναι, καθιστάναι. The periphrasis with ποιεῖσθαι is especially used after military movements and political measures; thus in iii. 2, 1, τὴν ἀπόστασιν ποιήσασθαι; iii. 53, 1, τὴν παράδοσιν τῆς πόλεως . . . ἐποιήσαμεθα; iii. 66, 2, ξύμβασιν ποιησάμενοι; vi. 42, 1, ἐπεξέτασιν τοῦ στρατεύματος καὶ σύνταξιν . . . ἐποίησαντο; vii. 17, 3, πέμψιν τῶν νεῶν ποιήσασθαι; vii. 41, 1, τὴν κατάφευξιν ἐποιοῦντο ἐς τὸν ἐαντῶν ὄρμον; viii. 3, 2, τὴν πρόσταξιν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐποιοῦντο.

The periphrasis with γίγνεσθαι, though less frequent in occurrence, seems to be more varied in its composition. iii. 23, 5, ἐγένετο ἡ διάφευξις αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον διὰ τοῦ χειμῶνος τὸ μέγεθος; iii. 89, 3, παραπλησίᾳ γίγνεται ἐπὶ κλυσις; iv. 38, 3, γενομένων ἐπερωτήσεων δις ἢ τρίς; iv. 85, 1, ἡ μὲν ἔκπεμψίς μου ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων γεγένηται; iv. 95, 1, δι' ὀλίγου ἡ παραίνεσις γίγνεται; iv. 135, 1, ἡ πρόσθεσις ἐγένετο; vi. 103, 4, κύρωσις οὐδεμία ἐγένετο; vii. 4, 6, τῶν πληρωμάτων κάκωσις ἐγένετο; viii. 66, 2, οὔτε ζήτησις οὔτε δικαίωσις ἐγένετο.

The periphrasis with παρέχειν is mostly ἔκπληξις; thus, iv. 55, 3, ἔκπληξιν μεγίστην παρείχε; vi. 46, 4, μεγάλην τὴν ἔκπληξιν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις παρείχε; vii. 70, 6, ἔκπληξιν τε ἅμα καὶ ἀποστέρησιν τῆς ἀκοῆς . . . παρέχειν. The same term occurs with καθιστάναι, and with παραστήναι; vi. 36, 2, τὴν πόλιν

ἐς ἐκπληξιν καθιστάναι; viii. 96, 1, τοῖς δ' Ἀθηναίοις . . . ἐκπληξιν μεγίστη παρέστη.

The periphrasis with ἔχειν occurs in a passive sense in iv. 126, 1, εἰ μὴ ὑπώπτευον ὑμᾶς ἐκπληξιν ἔχειν; but actively a little below, iv. 126, 5, τὴν μέλλησιν ἔχουσι τοῖς ἀπείροις φοβερὰν; *ibidem*, ἔχει δὴλωσιν ἀπειλῆς; vi. 41, 4, τὴν ἐξέτασιν αὐτῶν ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν. The harshest and most abnormal employment of ἔχειν is found in ii. 61, 2, τὸ μὲν λυποῦν ἔχει ἤδη τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐκάστω. The tendency towards periphrasis may be observed elsewhere in Thucydides, particularly with *nomina agentis* in -της; e. g. i. 35, 4, τῶνδε κωλυταὶ . . . γενήσεσθε; i. 132, 5, μηνυτῆς γίγνεται. Cf. iii. 2, 3; iii. 23, 2; iii. 59, 2, ἰκέται γυγνόμεθα.

With reference to the use of these verbals, it may be of interest to compare Thucydides with some of the most important writers of Greek prose who stood nearest to him. These are Herodotus, Antiphon, and the author of *περὶ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας* as his predecessors, and Xenophon, as his successor.

The eighth book of Herodotus is equivalent to about one sixth of Thucydides. The occurrences of the -σις nouns number 40, and are to those in an equal amount of Thucydides as 3 to 5. But 15 are nouns long in vogue, with established concrete meaning, such as στάσις, ὄψις, ἄλωσις, σύνεσις, διάβασις, φύσις, πρόφασις, σκήψις, τάξις, κατάβασις, ἀνάβασις, and the like. The following are not found in Thucydides: ἐξήλυσις, ἐπάγεσις, ἔλασις, ἐπαύρεσις, ὑπόφανσις, ἔκλειψις, ἀπιξις. Eight are cases with a genitive objective attached. The most striking feature of Thucydidean usage which is wanting in this portion of Herodotus, is the accumulation and insertion of attributives and other modifiers.

As for Antiphon, the bulk of that author is equivalent to one eighth of Thucydides, and a little more. We find some thirty-eight cases, or about three quarters of the Thucydidean average. The percentage of independent and original formations is much larger than in Herodotus; thus we find πόσις, 'potatio,' φόνευσις, ἀπόφευξις, ἀποψήφισις, τήμησις, αἰτίασις,

ἀναίρεσις, ἴασις, διάγνωσις, and in iv. 22, a double compound, μετέκβασις. A case of accumulated construction reminding us greatly of Thucydides is found in iv. 95, τοῦ δὲ τούτοις πειθομένους ἐξεργάσασθαι ἃ οὗτοι βούλονται οὐκ ἔστιν ἴασις.

The pamphlet περὶ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας is equivalent to nine pages of Stahl's Thucydides, which of course is too little to base any computation upon. Only four cases occur: κτήσις, θέσις, τάξις, and πρόφασις. κτήσις is used in concrete sense, i. 19, διὰ τὴν κτήσιν, τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὑπερορίοις. θέσις and τάξις are construed with genitive objective: iii. 3, περὶ νόμων θέσεως; iii. 5, αἱ τάξεις τοῦ φόρου.

Of Xenophon I selected for comparison his continuation of Thucydides, viz. the first three books of the Hellenica, these being equal in bulk to one fifth of Thucydides. The result is quite significant. There are only some twenty-five occurrences, or considerably less than one third as many as Thucydides would have in that space. The variety is limited, and concrete nouns like πρόφασις, στάσις, πρᾶξις, κρίσις, φύσις make up most of the count. But a very small number of freer formations deserve mention, such as φοίτησις, i. 6, 7, ταῖς ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας φοιτήσεσιν. At iii. 5, 5, is a noteworthy case of accumulation: πάλαι ὀργιζόμενοι αὐτοῖς τῆς τε ἀντιλήψεως τῆς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος δεκάτης ἐν Δεκελείᾳ καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ μὴ ἐβελῆσαι ἀκολουθήσαι.